REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 90-123 were pending in this application when last examined by the Examiner. Claims 90, 94, 98, 101-102, 106, 109-110, 114 and 118 have been amended. Claim 124 has been added. The amendments find full support in the original specification, claims, and drawings. No new matter has been added. In view of the above amendments and remarks that follow, reconsideration and an early indication of allowance of the now pending claims 90-124 are respectfully requested.

Claim 118 is objected to as depending upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant has now be rewritten claim 118 in independent format to include all of the limitations of base claim 114. Claim 118 is now in condition for allowance.

Claims 90-117 and 119-123 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Srinivasan et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2001/0023436) in view of Jerding (U.S. Patent No. 6,738,982). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Srinivasan discloses an authoring system for interactive video which has two or more authoring stations for providing authored metadata to be related to a main video data stream and a multiplexer for relating authored metadata from the authoring sources to the main video data stream. (Abstract). The authoring stations include a tracking module which tracks the frame-by-frame movement of an image entity, and generates coordinates of the tracked image entity. (0051-0052). The end result of the tracking process is "a series of coordinates of an assumed center point of a tracking object associated with the image entity selected to be tracked." (0052). Even if, *arguendo*, the image tracking data were deemed to include the claimed "graphics data associated with one or more video objects in the particular video frame," Srinivasan's image tracking data fails to also include "an identifier to an object mapping table including an entry associated with each of the one or more video objects in the particular video frame, each entry in the object mapping table referencing one or more information data structures including information associated with the corresponding video object" as is now required by claim 90.

Furthermore, although Srinivasan discloses that multiple authors may track separate images and add annotations to be delivered in an annotation data stream, nothing in Srinivasan teaches the use of the claimed "object mapping table" and "information data structures" to organize and store the annotation data so that they can be related back to the tracked objects. What is more, nothing in Srinivasan teaches or suggests the "particular one of the information data structures including an indicia indicative that a particular one of the one or more video objects is linked to one of the plurality of multiplexed program streams, and an identifier for a particular one of the plurality of multiplexed program streams."

The Examiner acknowledges that Srinivsan "is silent on reviewing the indicia in the object to determine whether the object is linked to one of the program streams, and in response to determining that the object is linked to one of the program streams, switching from the current program stream to presenting the particular one of the program streams." (Office action, pp. 4-5). However, he relies on Jerding to make up for this deficiency.

Jerding discloses the use of HREF calls to select different television services. Jerding, however, fails to teach or suggest that the "indicia indicative that a particular one of the one or more video objects is linked to one of the plurality of multiplexed program streams" and "identifier for a particular one of the plurality of multiplexed program streams" is contained in the "particular one of the information data structures" which is associated to the "object mapping table" and "mask" in the manner claimed in claim 90. Accordingly, claim 90 is now in condition for allowance.

Claims 98, 106, and 114 contain limitations that are similar to the limitations of claim 90 which make claim 90 allowable. Accordingly, claims 98, 106, and 114 are also in condition for allowance.

Claims 91-97, 99-105, 107-113, 115-117, and 119-123 are also in condition for allowance because they depend on an allowable base claim, and for the additional limitations that they contain.

Claim 124 is new in this application. Claim 124 is also in condition for allowance because it depends on an allowable base claim, and for the additional limitations that it contains.

Specifically, claim 124 adds the limitation that "in response to the viewer actuation, the receiver is further programmed to: retrieve the identifier of the object mapping table from the mask corresponding to the actuated graphics image; retrieve the object mapping table based on the retrieved identifier; locate the entry in the object mapping table for the particular video object; identify the particular information data structure referenced in the located entry; and retrieve the indicia from the particular information data structure," which is not taught nor suggested by the cited references.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration and an early indication of allowance of the now pending claims 90-124 is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP

By _____
Josephine E. Chang
Reg. No. 46,083
626/795-9900

JEC/lal

RJL PAS712226.1-*-11/28/06 4:56 PM